IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.17642 of 2006
Date of decision 9 .11.2006

Mohinder Singh .. petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another .. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

PRESENT: Ms. Tarun Jain , Advocate for the petitioner

M.M.Kumar, J.

The father of the petitioner expired on 2.6.1976 while he was in service. The petitioner was aged about two months old at that time. A request for compassionate appointment for adjustment of the petitioner or his brother is stated to have been sent by the mother of the petitioner which was rejected on 16.2.2004 (Annexure P.1). According to the impugned order, a sum of Rs. 18,000/- on account of ex-gratia compensation which has already been sanctioned and paid to the mother of the petitioner, his case has not been considered fit for appointment against ex-gratia scheme which is highly belated.

Having heard the learned counsel, we are of the view that there is huge delay in filing the application for compassionate appointment. Father of the petitioner had died in the year 1976 and in all these years the family has been able to sustain itself. The object of compassionate appointment is to help the family of deceased employee to tide over the financial crisis created by the sudden death of such an employee. That charge appears to have been over-come. For the afore-mentioned view, we find supports from the view taken by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the

cases of Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd v. A.Radhika Thirumalai (1996)3 SCC 394, National Hydro Electric Power Corporation v. Nanak Chand (2004)12 SCC 487, State of Manipur v. Mohd. Rajodin (2003) 7 SCC 511 and Commissioner of Public Instructions v. K.R.Vishwanathan (2005) 7 SCC 206. There is no ground to interfere. Dismissed.

(M.M.Kumar)
Judge

(M.M.S.Bedi)
Judge

9.11.2006
okg